



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,551	08/05/2003	Yoshifumi Noge	69806 CCD	6036

7590 11/30/2005

Christopher C. Dunham
c/o Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Ave. of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

HESS, BRUCE H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1774

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/634,551

Applicant(s)

NOGE ET AL.

Examiner

Bruce H. Hess

Art Unit

1774

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10-3-05 (Election)
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1-31-05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1774

The restriction requirement is adhered to and made final for the reasons of record.

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either of the patents to Sato (USP 5,413,854) or Katsuoka et al. (USP 6,780,479).

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Kobayashi et al. (USP 6,214,458).

These patents teach receiving paper for hot melt transfer elements. The receiving layers (e.g., polyester or polyurethane) are applied as emulsions and dried. Kobayashi et al. additionally teach a cross-linked intermediate layer. Sato additionally teaches glass transition temperatures which overlap with applicants' claimed values. While none of these references specify applying a tackifying layer on the back of the paper substrate, to do so would have been an obvious expedient to one of ordinary skill in this art in order to adhere the resulting imaged article to something else (e.g., function as a label).

Claims 1-7 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5 and 12 of copending Application No. 10/308,536. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because one of ordinary must look to the specification to interpret the claims (e.g., determine how to apply the receiving layer ?). In the latter case, the specification describes the advantages of applying the receiving layer as an emulsion and then drying.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.



BRUCE H. HESS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1300